DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 331 EA 023 908

AUTHOR Worner, Wayne; Parks, David
TITLE Designing and Implementing a Collaborative Field-Based and Problem-Centered Doctoral Program: A Case Study.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; *Cooperative Education; Doctoral Degrees; *Doctoral Programs; Educational Administration; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Professional Development; *Program Development
IDENTIFIERS *Virginia Polytechnic Inst and State Univ

ABSTRACT

Issues in designing and implementing a collaborative field-based and problem-centered principal preparation doctoral program at Virginia Tech are discussed in this case study. Implemented in 1989 to replace the old certification-driven principal-preparation system, the program's key components include collaborative planning, program delivery, and evaluation; a modular, integrated curriculum grounded in theory, research, and practice; internships at two different school levels and one business or agency; and diverse instructional delivery systems. Following a description of the program, five explanations are offered for incorporating change. Nine program assumptions are outlined, some of which include a focus on practitioners, continued development, participative decision making, cooperative instruction, and faculty development. The planning process regarding program requirements, delivery, and evaluation is described next. A conclusion is that although questions remain, the program is becoming more responsive to faculty, participants, and school system needs. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED344331

DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING A COLLABORATIVE FIELD-BASED AND PROBLEM-CENTERED DOCTORAL PROGRAM: A CASE STUDY

Wayne Worner and David Parks

Beginnings

As a result of a retreat in November of 1987, the faculty of the Educational Administration Program Area in the College of Education at Virginia Tech scrapped their old certification-driven principal-preparation program and created a new program for the initial preparation of school principals. The new program was implemented in the fall of 1989 after extensive collaboration with local school districts. Key components of the program included: collaborative planning, program delivery, and evaluation; a modular, integrated curriculum grounded in theory, research, and practice; an extensive internship at one school level and field experiences at one other school level and in a business or agency outside of education; a wide range of instructional delivery systems, including whole-group instruction, simulations, coaching, issues seminars, workshops, telephone conferencing, satellite workshops, directed reading, case studies, and individualized assignments. With the support of the Danforth Foundation, the Virginia Department of Education, the Appalachian Regional Laboratory, and six cooperating school systems, the pilot program was carried out over a 24-month period. Nine students completed the program and received masters degrees or certificates of advanced graduate studies in addition to principal certification in August 1992.

EA 023 908

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Worner
D. Parks
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

After minor modifications, a second iteration of the program was begun in Southwest Virginia, some 110 miles from the main campus of the university, in the fall of 1991. That program, now in its second semester, enrolls 26 aspiring administrators from eight cooperating school districts.

During the planning of the second cycle of the field-based principal preparation program, Virginia Tech was invited to become a member of the National Alliance for Developing School Leaders, a consortium of universities who, with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), are examining ways to use the NASSP assessment, training and development programs (Springfield, Leader 1,2,3; From the Desk of --, Let's Talk) in principal preparation programs. That project, funded for five years by the Danforth Foundation, reinforced the need to look at leadership training and development from a broader perspective.

Organizations, especially institutions of higher education, are generally slow to change. Once in awhile, however, the special conditions necessary for rapid, significant, and systemic change are in place to support reform and restructuring. Such was the case at Virginia Tech at the close of the decade of the 80's. The College of Education at Virginia Tech was fairly young. The college was formed in 1971 and most (10 of 13) of the EDAD faculty joined the staff during the first five years of the college's life. Turnover had been low and relationships within the faculty were, for the most part, friendly and collaborative. Morale was generally high. Most of the faculty came to Virginia Tech in their early 30's and planned to continue at the university indefinitely. These conditions, especially the highly supportive, cooperative relationship among faculty (thought to be atypical of programs around the country)

appear to be the crucial components facilitating the program changes at Tech. The absence of these conditions and the inability of faculty to meet and agree on new directions are often cited as reasons for the slow pace of change in preparation programs.

A part of the tradition of the Educational Administration Program Area at Tech is a two-day retreat during which faculty examine their individual and collective accomplishments, review opportunities, consider options, and establish priorities. A consensus planning model is used in these meetings. It was at one of these meetings that the program area determined that its existing preparation programs were in need of revision and declared a commitment to make improvements. These annual gatherings away from campus serve to coalesce faculty through communication. Goals and directions are debated and priorities agreed to. New initiatives are approved and schedules established. The result is a faculty which supports its decisions through action.

The excellent working relationship faculty had with school leaders throughout the Commonwealth eased the way for collaborative efforts with school districts. Approximately one in three school superintendents in Virginia are graduates or current students in Virginia Tech's programs. The university has a history of working closely with local school systems in cooperative efforts. The faculty also had considerable experience in designing and conducting collaborative off-campus degree programs. Over the first two decades of the college's lifespan, cooperative doctoral programs had been planned and operated with Old Dominion University (Hampton Roads), Virginia Commonwealth University (Richmond), and Federal City College now a part of

the University of the District of Columbia (Washington, DC). A sixth-year certificate program had been designed and delivered in cooperation with James Madison University, and a cooperative masters degree program had been conducted with Radford University. Several in-tact (cohort) masters and sixth year programs had been delivered by Virginia Tech alone in various locations throughout the state. In addition, the EDAD program area had delivered graduate programs in nearly a dozen overseas locations since 1975.

The program is fortunate to have strong administrative support and encouragement for its extension efforts. Program development and delivery in off-campus locations are encouraged and supported by the college and the university. Enlightened administrators tend not to employ accountability measures which might discourage or penalize faculty collaboration.

The Genie

Following the successful implementation of the two field-based, collaborative programs to prepare school-based administrators and the decision to adopt that model as Virginia Tech's approach to the initial preparation and certification of school leaders, faculty began to examine the adequacy of existing course-based, advanced-preparation models.

Over the two decades of the college's life, more than 500 EDAD doctorates had been awarded. Graduates of the program were serving as college presidents, superintendents, state agency personnel, principals, private school leaders, consultants, and in a wide range of other educational leadership positions throughout

the country. The faculty had worked cooperatively with other institutions in the development of fairly conventional course-based programs throughout the state. By most conventional standards, our advanced preparation programs were acknowledged to be productive and of high quality. Several--notably school finance, school law, and special education administration--had achieved national recognition. Why then would a faculty with security, longevity, and a degree of success consider major changes in its program design and delivery systems?

Several explanations seem to be plausible.

1. The fact that the faculty had been successful in operating a conventional program provided the security to "try something new".
2. The success of our efforts with a restructured initial preparation program provided the anticipation of success necessary to stimulate efforts to change the doctoral program. The success with these programs had **uncorked the bottle**.
3. We recognized that students participating in a dynamic initial preparation program with a wide range of instructional experiences blending theory with practice would be disappointed (perhaps reluctant) if their continuing education required them to return to a conventional course-based, content-driven curriculum. In effect, **"the genie was out of the bottle"**.
4. External pressures to change the focus and content of leadership preparation programs and obvious shifts in expectations of school leaders raised questions as to the efficacy of the current program. It

should be noted that the external pressures became reinforcers for the change efforts already internalized by faculty, both individually and collectively. The only pressure to change came from within as faculty examined the adequacy and relevancy of the current program.

5. Maturity and mid-life crisis may account for much of the decision to make program changes. As a program faculty, we had observed and participated in the "birthing process" (most of us were here when the college was formed); we had lived through adolescence (the promoting, tenuring, and career change opportunities); and enjoyed early adulthood (program productivity and recognition of success). The median age of the EDAD faculty in 1990 was 53. Faculty members had developed personal teaching, research, and consulting interests. Options available to the faculty included: "Do your own thing", "Do as little as possible and slide into retirement", or "Make something happen". A critical mass of faculty chose the last option. Other faculty members who, for a variety of reasons, were less interested in efforts to implement major new initiatives, were, nonetheless, supportive and willing to participate as collaborators in a new program activity. Those faculty who committed to a major role in design, development, and delivery of a new program viewed the effort as a personal development opportunity. The genie was now in command; life would not be the same in educational administration at Virginia Tech.

Exploring New Paradigms

Two faculty members who had worked closely with the field-based initial preparation program began preliminary discussions about the development of a field-based doctoral program in the spring of 1990. Motivating factors included the existence of salary schedule structures in area school districts which rewarded sixth-year certificates (CAGS) and doctorates; an interest on the part of some faculty in exploring "new" approaches to graduate education with special emphasis on instructional leadership skills; an environment supportive of change; and the encouragement of former and current students to design a problem-centered curriculum.

Initial discussions between the two EDAD faculty about a field-based program produced a set of assumptions which represented their views about a new program. Those assumptions included:

1. The primary target of such a program should be practitioners--not aspiring administrators. The focus of the program would be on problem solving, not skill development. Efforts would be made to recruit highly successful school administrators who would meet all certification requirements prior to admission to the program. While we believe that school leadership is not and should not be solely the prerogative of administrators, the decision was made to limit the first cohort to administrators--defined as school leaders with budget and personnel authority.

2. The belief that education is more than training. The practical implication of selecting competent, respected, and skilled administrators is that basic management skills need not be taught as a part of the program.

3. Preparation is not enough, continued development is essential to the success of the school leader. The end of the initial preparation program is only the beginning of developing competence in administration. One must continue to learn and grow to maintain and enhance competence in the field. This program should build on the skill base of the initial preparation program and push further learning in education and related fields.

4. Adult learners need to play a major role in designing the programs in which they are involved. The program design and delivery system should be cooperatively developed by the faculty and participants. All elements of the program--admission, selection, content, schedule, selection of resources, and evaluation--should be on the table for negotiation.

5. Instruction should be a cooperative activity. This belief included a desire to move the program beyond the boundary of the department, to seek colleagues in other departments, colleges, institutions, and local school districts who might be willing to participate in the planning and development of such a program. The belief also assumed that program participants have much to share with their colleagues and faculty and that those resources should be systematically reviewed and utilized.

6. Change is the constant which should undergird the program objectives. Our hope was to identify school leaders who would find themselves in positions to facilitate qualitative improvement in education at all levels of the education enterprise. Our desire was to aide those leaders in developing the knowledge, competencies, attitudes, and skills which would contribute to their ability to positively affect education in America. Change is not an orderly process. As a consequence, no program could be preestablished which would prepare participants to "manage the process". It was our intent to design a dynamic program which, through continuing review and participation of the stakeholders, would model the change process.

7. Change is a creative activity that requires getting one's hands dirty. We believed that the best way to train change agents (the new transformational leaders) was to engage them in real-life change efforts in the schools. We went as far as saying that the success of the program would hinge on whether the participants actually made changes in their schools.

8. Evaluation is an important element in the change process. The program should constantly evaluate itself using internal and external criteria and procedures. Faculty and program participants should plan and conduct program reviews regularly. Feedback from these reviews should be incorporated into ongoing planning.

9. Participating faculty viewed the development and implementation of the program as a personal and professional staff development activity. In part, the success of the program would be determined based upon the growth and development of faculty as well as the participants.

Following the development of a set of assumptions upon which a new program might be based, the two faculty members began to explore their idea with colleagues within the EDAD program area, with other colleagues in the Curriculum and Instruction Division, and with practitioners in nearby school systems. Two other EDAD faculty members (CC/LA) expressed a willingness to participate actively in the developmental activities; four others (PJ/GE/DA/DS) indicated their support of such an effort. Three colleagues in the Curriculum and Instruction Division (TW/JN/LW) accepted an invitation to become full partners in the program planning and development activities. In addition one former colleague (SP/on assignment to the Provost's office) accepted an invitation to become a part of the planning team.

Initial contacts and discussion with potential applicants spanned a period of eighteen months. The earliest of those discussions expressed the interest of faculty in the collaborative development (with participants) of a field-based, problem-centered doctoral program which would extend over a four-year period. Specific details were limited. Prerequisites included:

- Participants would be practicing administrators.
- Participants would be certified as administrators or supervisors **or** be willing to meet certification requirements concurrently **and** in addition to the planned program requirements.

- Participants would have the support of their home school system.
- Participants would enroll as a cohort and participate in all scheduled program activities during the four-year period of the program.
- Institutional admission criteria would be met.
- Participants would assist in the design and delivery of a new and different graduate program.

These expectations were shared with potential applicants from the Roanoke County school system during the 1990 - 1991 school year. As developmental activities continued, a decision was made to expand the number of school systems and the potential pool of participants.

Staff development officials in ten area school systems were contacted with information about the proposed program in the spring of 1991. Interested parties were encouraged to attend a series of meetings held during the spring and summer of 1991 to discuss the program and engage in initial program planning activities. The faculty planning team, comprised of seven professors who had agreed to serve as "assigned faculty" for the program, had begun to meet regularly during that period of time. Six meetings with potential applicants took place during the initial planning stages of the program. The idea was to have potential participants "try it before you buy it." We knew that this program was not for everyone. Those requiring a highly structured, teacher-directed learning environment probably would not fare well in this program. This up-front honesty helped about two-thirds of those who expressed an interest to opt out. Although over 75 individuals met with the planning team at least

once during the period from March 1991 to August 1991, only 23 accepted invitations to join the program.

Modeling as a Program Development Strategy

Striking a balance between active involvement of participants in program development and a kind of planning paralysis induced by ambiguity was one of the initial challenges facing faculty and potential participants. Coming to grips with the range of decisions which could or should be collaborative was a first order of business. The doctoral program in educational administration at Virginia Tech has fairly broad parameters within institutional and collegiate guidelines. Program planners did not feel that those institutional guidelines (minimum number of credits from Virginia Tech, previous academic record, age of courses, etc.) were sufficiently onerous to require review or waiver by the institution. Virginia Tech vests most of the quality control for degree programs in the department authorized to award the degree and the student's faculty committee. Collegiate requirements for the CAGS and the Ed.D. specify blocks of coursework to be included in programs of study but not specific courses. Students completing a doctorate must meet research (12 hrs), dissertation (20 hrs), foundations (12 hrs), applied studies (36 hrs), and cognate (9 hrs) course-hour requirements. Students are not, however, required to take any specific courses. Courses to meet the EDAD degree requirements are determined by the faculty of the program area. Dissertation guidelines are extremely flexible. Variations to existing requirements must be reviewed and approved by the faculty in the program area.

Given those parameters, the decision was made by the faculty program planning team to design a program which, over a four year period, would include the following:

- 18 semester hours of applied study
- 3 semester hours of foundations study
- 10 semester hours of research
- 2 semester hours of proposal development seminar
- 24 semester hours of dissertation

Because the program was designed as a cohort experience, all participants would be required to participate in the entire program, regardless of their previous academic experiences. Participants whose prior academic work, when added to the proposed program content, would not meet institutional or collegiate degree requirements, were required to "remediate" those deficiencies. (After an analysis of transcripts, arrangements were made to assist students in accessing relevant course material in foundations, cognate, and research.)

While there appeared to be little need to change program requirements, there was considerable desire to change both content and delivery systems. Typically, students in the doctoral program will design their program of studies with an advisor, selecting from a menu of self-standing courses sufficient to meet the course credit requirements outlined by the college and program area. As in many programs, there is only accidental articulation between courses and little program focus except that which is brought to the program by the student. Courses are usually taught by individual faculty members as self-contained units. Integration of course work is left to

the student. Research and dissertation is generally looked upon as something to be concerned about after the course work has been completed. It was hoped that this program would be different. Faculty members had varied notions about how the program should be different. Most believed that theory, practice, and research should be integrated. Most also believed that the research should be applied to school- or system-based problems. Open meetings were scheduled to discuss the program goals, purposes, possible content, participant needs and interests, and faculty interests and commitment. Faculty members engaged in planning discussions (fishbowl) as a part of those early meetings in an effort to demonstrate the developing nature of the program and to model consensual decision making and problem identification, analysis and the solution. Potential applicants dropped in and dropped out. Those with relatively high tolerance for ambiguity and an interest in a different approach to graduate study became "regulars". Faculty stated openly that they were looking for participants who would commit to the duration and that in turn they (the faculty) would make the same commitment. Meetings were developed as sample classes to provide participants with a clearer view of how the program would likely work. Future participants were asked to identify their needs, interests, and preferred modes of learning. Consensus-building activities and constant feedback became a part of each session.

Finally, in the early summer, faculty concluded that there existed a critical mass of interested students to support the program. Six of the seven faculty members who had been involved in the developmental planning and the exploratory meetings agreed that they were willing to spend the equivalent of one day a week working with

the program. Thirty-two regular attendees to the "trial seminars" were invited to interview for admission to the program. Twenty-eight accepted the invitation to interview. All were invited to participate in the program. Twenty-three accepted the invitation to participate, and the program officially began in September of 1991.

Program Planning and Delivery

While there was considerable agreement within the participating faculty about elements of change which should be incorporated in the field-based program, there were also several differences in beliefs about program purpose, how and which changes should be implemented, and to what degree. One faculty member stated his beliefs about purpose by indicating he "would be pleased if those who completed the program would successfully implement changes which improved the quality of education for young people". The goal of the program from his view point was to prepare "change agents". Another faculty member placed major emphasis on the development of collaboration and inquiry skills by the participants. While these two views were not necessarily inconsistent they do suggest at least slightly different approaches. Some faculty members had a higher task orientation than others. They expressed uneasiness about lack of specificity in goals and product/program evaluation. Regular meetings and the attendance of all six faculty at most of the program sessions have helped work through many of those differences. As a consequence, course content and design remains dynamic. For example, one idea was to use the first semester course to develop the program. The idea was to examine individual needs and interests, institutional expectations, available resources,

options for organizing content and structure, delivery systems, assessment and evaluation strategies, and all of the other elements of program design and delivery to outline the program parameters for the four year period. Far better to use a real curriculum development effort than a hypothetical plan it was reasoned.

As a part of the preprogram planning activities, however, a balance was struck between participants' needs to expand their information and knowledge base and their need to develop collaboration and inquiry skills. Participants identified the major problems and issues facing American schools and clustered those concerns around three study topics: curriculum/instruction, change, and parent/child/school relationships. Research-study teams were organized around each study topic using a Participatory Action Research model of inquiry. Class time (classes meet on alternate Wednesdays and Thursdays from 5 to 8 PM) was divided to address the earlier identified information and inquiry/collaboration skill needs of participants. Wednesdays were scheduled for direct, whole-group instructional activities and Thursdays were reserved for the small group, participatory action groups. In addition, six, day-long meetings were scheduled to provide sufficient time for in-depth study of topics, guest consultants, or workshops as needed.

Topics addressed during the Wednesday whole-group sessions during fall term of 1991 included:

- Journals and Notebooks
- Issues Identification
- Group Process
- Problem Solving

- Participatory Action Research Methods
- Consensus Building
- Priority Setting
- Program Evaluation Methodology

The objective of these sessions was to develop or enhance the skills of participants in the specific topics. Participation, coaching, and feedback were integral parts of most sessions. Several activities were used to support program planning. The session on "issues identification" was a precursor to the development of small group research and development teams; group process skill development was designed to enhance the productivity of the work teams; consensus building and priority setting activities included a Nominal Group Process activity which yielded a listing of participant needs to be addressed in subsequent day-long workshops and seminars.

Day-long seminars during the fall included a session dealing with Excellence and Equity in education. A coalition of mostly rural, poor Virginia school districts had brought suit claiming the current school finance formula was both inequitable and inadequate and, according to Virginia's Constitution, unconstitutional. School finance specialists, urban and rural school superintendents, and representatives of the Virginia Board of Education were invited to discuss the pros and cons of the suit during a day-long review of the issue. A second day-long session was devoted to educational reform with representatives of the National Governors' Association, New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC), the Virginia State Department of Education, local school boards, governing boards, local industry, and parents' groups discussing recent reform initiatives with the program participants.

The three research groups meet as small groups (six to nine members) working together to achieve group-sponsored projects. These groups generally meet on Thursdays but can rearrange their schedules as needed. Each group is assigned two faculty members who serve as resources to the group. Each group is engaged in research designed to address educational problem(s). In the case of the curriculum and instruction study group, most members are pursuing individual projects designed to address specific problems in their respective schools. Group meetings are designed to provide support and exchange information within the group. Members may coalesce and work together on certain issues. Examples of projects underway include: redesigning the curriculum in an elementary school around a non-graded, continuous progress philosophy, development of a study skills curriculum for elementary and middle schools in a small rural school district, and designing an improved internal communication network for a 600 student elementary school. The parent/child/school study group is examining ways in which the school can build stronger relationships between parents and children. The group is currently working with the parents and Chapter 1 teachers in an elementary school in Roanoke County (VA). Through a "celebration of learning" teachers will demonstrate ways in which parents can work and interact with their children to enhance their relationship and their children's performance in school. The group examining change is interested in the change phenomenon and the conditions which seem to improve the likelihood that changes will be accepted and implemented according to plan. They are currently undertaking research to determine how well a specific change model (PAC model) predicts successful implementation of change (advisory teams) in middle schools.

Members of each group share their progress with members of the other groups through participation in jigsawing (reconfiguring the groups by assigning at least two members of each group to new groups) activities periodically. Each group is also responsible for the preparation of a research report, monograph, or other formal presentation which will disseminate the results of their work.

Evaluating the First Semester

At the end of the first term, participants and faculty were confronted with the need to conduct assessment activities for the purpose of assigning grades to the participants. One faculty member was assigned to prepare a proposal for program and individual assessment. After consulting with participating faculty, a proposal was presented to the participants outlining a plan for end-of-term assessment. The plan proposed that each participant prepare a two-to-three page, written description of the participant's growth during the term, including contributions to the small-group activities. The proposal also suggested that each person prepare a short evaluation of every other group members' contributions. Participants were asked to critique the proposal and present alternative proposals. A number of suggestions indicated the original proposal was too complex and cumbersome. Following a group discussion, an alternative plan was outlined which required each participant to prepare a portfolio with documents and data describing growth and development across four categories: (1) contributions to the group (collaboration), (2) engagement in research and inquiry, (3) other learnings, and (4) a self-analysis. Participants were invited to solicit input (written or oral) from colleagues regarding their participation in and contribution to

their group. Hour-long evaluation conferences were scheduled during which each participant met with the two faculty members assigned to their respective groups. Participants were asked to rate their performance on the three dimensions (inquiry, collaboration, other learnings) as acceptable, above average, excellent, or outstanding. Self-evaluation and faculty evaluations were used to determine the grade for the term. Most grades awarded were at the level proposed by the participant. Five grades assigned were higher than the grade recommended by the student; two were lower. Students who received grades lower than those they recommended were given the opportunity to appeal the decision. Neither of those receiving lower grades appealed.

Next Steps

At the conclusion of the first academic term of the program, faculty members met in extended sessions to assess the progress of individuals, the groups, the program, and themselves over the four-month period. Concerns were expressed as to whether the program was meeting established objectives. Underlying the concerns was an uneasy feeling on the part of some that students were not reading enough and not producing enough. After lengthy discussion, we concluded that the program participants had probably been more actively engaged in learning than in most of our programs but that we were still uncomfortable in our ability to assess (especially in a quantifiable way) their individual growth and progress. We also began to raise questions about the kind of research which might be appropriate to meet the dissertation requirement. While these concerns were not resolved, faculty did agree that the program was progressing reasonably well. We were all anxious to see how

many of the 23 original participants would show up for the second term. Our fears were not realized. All 23 of the program's participants were present for the first sessions following the Christmas holidays.

Program design for the second term remained the same--Wednesdays for whole group activities, Thursdays for small group participatory action research projects, and day-long sessions reserved for "hot topics", special seminars or workshops. Program content was reoriented to make transformational leadership and change the central concepts of the second term curriculum. The planning group decided that a concept was needed to guide the program, and following deliberation of the kind of leader needed in education, settled on James MacGregor Burns' transformational leader. Because such leaders create, guide, inspire, monitor, and assess change, extensive work on the change process on education was felt to be needed and was included in the plan for the spring. Accordingly, topics to be addressed in the Wednesday sessions included transformational leadership, change models, restructuring, and the dynamics of change. A decision was made to continue the three operating research groups through the end of the spring term. At that time new groups will be organized around identified topics or issues.

One day-long session will bring together a group of educators from around the country to examine efforts to implement America 2000 initiatives, restructure the relationship between schools and society, and introduce Total Quality Management (TQM) and self-managing work teams into the school culture. Discussants will examine efforts by policy makers to improve the quality of American schools and the impacts of certain policy initiatives on local communities, schools, and educational

professionals. Program participants and faculty will participate in a Leader 1,2,3 or Springfield training seminar, which is available at no cost through Virginia Tech's involvement in the National Alliance, later this spring.

The assessment and development materials developed by NASSP are being reviewed by National Alliance institutions for their potential use in initial principal preparation programs. We view the participants in the advanced degree program (RAP) as adjunct faculty and collaborators in our next round of principal preparation. As a consequence, we are providing opportunities for the participants to engage in the training with faculty.

The effort to design and implement a collaborative field-based and problem-centered doctoral program continues. As one colleague explains, "We are trying to build the airplane as we fly it". Enthusiasm on the part of participants and faculty remains high. Each week brings a new set of questions. How will the research core be changed given the likelihood that research questions/problems will be identified a year before the courses are usually offered? What kind of practitioner review board should be established? What should their role be? How might we use practitioners to enhance the relevance and quality of the research/dissertation? How different can a dissertation really be?

While we don't have the answer to any of these questions, we are confident that the answers will result in a program more responsive to faculty, participants, and school system needs.

Should or could all doctoral programs in our college or program area be patterned similarly? Probably not. Will the next iteration (if there is one) look the same? Probably not.

What we have invented is a unique program designed for a special group of students operating with a special group of faculty at a particular time in the life of the institution, the students, the faculty and American education.

What we are about, in organizational development terms, is unfreezing and change. It is likely, however, that the model of change, which suggests refreezing as the next step, is both inadequate and inappropriate to address what we need to be about in the preparation of school leaders. This program, then, is not a pilot to be examined for possible implementation, but a step along the way to a place we need to be.

Wayne Worner and David Parks are faculty members in the Educational Administration Program Area of the Administrative and Educational Services Division of the College of Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. While they were primarily responsible for the development of this paper, other faculty at Virginia Tech have played key roles in the program development described herein. Those collaborating faculty include:

Dr. Loyd Andrew, AES Division, Virginia Tech
Dr. Jerry Niles, C&I Division, Virginia Tech
Dr. Steve Parson, Graduate School, Virginia Tech
Dr. Larry Weber, C&I Division, Virginia Tech
Dr. Terry Wildman, C&I Division, Virginia Tech

Comments and inquiries are invited. You may contact any of the faculty at the address below:

Roanoke Area Program
EDAD - AES
211 East Eggleston Hall
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0302
Phone: (703) 231-5111